

Application Number: 10/561,705  
Reply Dated: April 28, 2011  
Office Action Dated: January 19, 2011

31. (new) The composition of claim 1, wherein the aromatic core is a single-aromatic-ring core.

32. (new) The composition of claim 1, wherein the aromatic core is:



### **REMARKS**

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)**

The current 35 USC § 102(b) rejection directed to claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 14-26, and 28-30; and based upon Kaneka '282 appears improper because all elements of the claimed invention aren't taught by Kaneka '282. Kaneka doesn't disclose Applicant's claimed element of "an aromatic core having one or more arms extending therefrom; ...." In addition to Kaneka not disclosing Applicant's "aromatic-core" claim element, it appears that the "aromatic-core" claim element isn't even mentioned in the Office Action's reasoning in support of its rejection. It's as if the "aromatic-core" claim element is simply overlooked as being an element of the claim, and because of this apparent oversight, the "aromatic-core" element isn't mentioned in the rejection. As a result, the Office Action has not shown that all of the claimed-invention elements are disclosed in a single reference.

Therefore, Applicant requests that the 35 USC § 102(b)-based rejection be withdrawn because the necessary elements to make such a rejection haven't been provided. Applicant also submits that Kaneka '282 doesn't teach them.

Application Number: 10/561,705  
Reply Dated: April 28, 2011  
Office Action Dated: January 19, 2011

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Regarding the 35 USC § 103 rejection based upon the combination of Kennedy et al. and Kaneka, it appears that the combination does not arrive at the claimed invention because neither of the publications teach the amended aromatic-core claim element.

Specifically, neither Kennedy et al. or Kaneka teaches the core moiety or core element being a single-ring aromatic core that is:



Therefore, because all of the claimed elements are not disclosed by the combination of Kennedy et al. or Kaneka, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been shown. Applicant therefore requests that the 35 USC § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

For the above reasons, Applicant requests that a notice of allowance please be issued with respect to the pending claims.

Respectfully,



Daniel J. Schlue Reg. No. 52,194  
Roetzel & Andress  
222 S. Main St.  
Akron, Ohio 44308  
Phone: (330) 376-2700  
Fax: (330) 376-4577  
Attorney for Applicant